

## **2.8      Land Use**

This section evaluates existing conditions for onsite and surrounding land uses within the County, relative to the Project areas addressed in this SEIR, and the potential effects that implementation of the proposed Project may have on such uses. This section also evaluates the potential for the proposed Project to result in physical division of an existing community, or to conflict with applicable land use or Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs).

### **2.8.1      Existing Conditions**

This section provides new existing conditions information that has come to light since adoption of the General Plan in August 2011 for land use within the unincorporated County as relates to the Project areas addressed in this SEIR. The remaining information in the General Plan Update PEIR relative to existing conditions applies equally to the Project areas addressed in this SEIR, and is therefore not repeated here. Discussion provided in the General Plan Update PEIR of existing conditions within community and subregional planning areas in the County that are not affected by the proposed Project was not updated herein; as such information would not pertain to the proposed Project (e.g. existing conditions for the County Islands CPA, Desert Subregion, Lakeside CPA, or Fallbrook CPA).

***Page 2.9-1, Section 2.9.1.2, Community and Subregional Planning Areas*** - Overall, the population of the unincorporated County has grown approximately ten percent from 442,919 in the year 2000 to 486,604 in the year 2010. Historically, the fastest growing areas have been those west of the SDCWA boundary in close proximity to infrastructure.

***Page 2.9-3, Section 2.9.1.2, Alpine CPA*** – In 2013, The Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians constructed a five-story 128-room hotel to the east of the Viejas Casino and is planning to construct a second hotel tower with 150 rooms.

***Page 2.9-4, Section 2.9.1.2, Central Mountain Subregion*** - Since 1992, and prior to adoption of the County of San Diego General Plan, a moratorium that was imposed on development within the Central Mountain Subregion that prohibited the County from processing applications for, or issuing or approving building permits, subdivision maps, other lot parcelizations, or any activity that could result in a change or alteration to the physical environment of privately-owned land in specified areas within the Subregion, with exception of obtaining building permits for existing legal lots, or for structures damaged by brush fires. With certification of the General Plan Update PEIR by the County Board of Supervisors (BOS), the moratorium was lifted.

***Page 2.9-8, Section 2.9.1.2, Jamul/Dulzura Subregion*** - The Jamul Indian Village occupies approximately six acres south of Jamul to the west of SR-94 and has filed a Fee-to-Trust application for an additional 101 acres to the west and north of this area. At the time of preparation of the General Plan Update, the tribe planned to construct a two-story casino building (approximately 205,000 square feet) on their six-acre parcel, along with a seven-story parking garage and 300-room hotel on the adjacent Fee-to-Trust land. As of March 2012, the

plan remained unapproved, and a revised proposal was presented that included construction of a three-story casino, a 10-level parking garage, and approximately 228,000 square feet of casino space in conjunction with a hotel.

*Page 2.9-45, Table 2.9-2, San Diego County Land Use Distribution Totals:*

<b>TABLE 2.9-2. 2009 SAN DIEGO COUNTY LAND USE DISTRIBUTION TOTALS</b>	
<b>General Land Use</b>	<b>Acreage</b>
<b>Residential Total</b>	<b>342,197</b>
Low Density Residential	182,172
Single Family	137,350
Mobile Homes	6,058
Multiple Family	16,617
<b>Commercial Total</b>	<b>33,531</b>
Commercial & Office	8,924
Commercial Recreation	18,002
Shopping Centers	6,604
<b>Industrial Total</b>	<b>19,199</b>
Light Industry	14,751
Heavy Industry	414
Extractive Industry	4,034
<b>Facilities Total</b>	<b>21,911</b>
Education	12,518
Communication - Utilities	4,867
Institutions	4,526
<b>Circulation Total</b>	<b>101,525</b>
Freeways/Roads	88,978
Miscellaneous Transportation	4,269
Junkyards, dumps, landfills	2,571
Airports	5,706
<b>Open Space Total</b>	<b>1,196,890</b>
Parks	1,078,053
Intensive Agriculture	118,836
Extensive Agriculture	0
<b>Miscellaneous Totals</b>	<b>1,010,279</b>
Military	133,100
Undeveloped/Vacant	841,407
Water	28,657
Miscellaneous	7,116
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,725,531</b>

Source: San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), 2009.

*Page 2.9-46, Table 2.9-3, FCI Acreage Totals by Community Planning Area:* Updated for consistency with the proposed Project.

**TABLE 2.9-3. FCI ACREAGE TOTALS BY PLANNING AREA**

<b>CPA or Subregion</b>	<b>Total Acreage Affected by the Proposed Project<sup>1</sup></b>
Alpine	13,748 <sup>2</sup>
Central Mountain	26,971
Desert	170
Jamul/Dulzura	1,246
Julian	8,467
Mountain Empire	2,052
North Mountain	17,218
Pendleton/De Luz	1,011
Ramona	831
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>71,712</b>

Note: Data has been rounded to the nearest number.

Source: County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services, 2012.

<sup>1</sup> Includes 382 acres of non-FCI lands.

<sup>2</sup> Applies to Alpine Pre-Study Land Use Map

*Page 2.9-46, Table 2.9-4, Proposed Road Improvements by Community* – Table 2.9-4 of the General Plan Update PEIR has been updated below to include those roadway segments that would be significantly impacted by the proposed Project, consistent with the findings of the Traffic Analysis prepared for the FCI Lands GPA (see Appendix D). The four road segments identified below would need additional travel lanes to accommodate the additional traffic generated by the proposed Project.

- Alpine Boulevard: Tavern Road to eastern end of Willows Road
- South Grade Road: Eltinge Drive to Olive View Road
- West Willows Road: Alpine Boulevard to Otto Avenue
- Willows Road: Viejas Casino Road to I-8 On-Ramp

The proposed Project includes a reclassification of Willows Road from Viejas Casino Road to the Interstate 8 westbound on-ramp from a two-lane to a four-lane road; however, the remaining three roads listed above would not be widened. Instead of widening these road segments, they would be included on Mobility Element Table M-4, Road Segments Where Adding Travel Lanes is Not Justified, because the County has determined it more appropriate to retain a road classification that could result in a level of service (LOS) E / F rather than increase the number of travel lanes. The rationale for not increasing the number of travel lanes for these roads, based on

criteria established in Mobility Element Policy M-2.1, is provided in Appendix D (see Attachment C, Revisions to GPU EIR Volume IV, Appendix F: Impacted Roadway Segments and Supporting Rationale for LOS E/F Level Acceptance).

Therefore, as shown in the revised Table 2.9-4, the number of roads to be widened in Alpine was increased from three to four.

**TABLE 2.9-4. PROPOSED ROAD IMPROVEMENTS BY COMMUNITY**

<b>CPA/Subregion</b>	<b>Number of New Roads or Extensions</b>	<b>Number of Roads to be Widened</b>	<b>Total Improvements</b>
Alpine	5	<del>3</del> <u>4</u>	<del>8</del> <u>9</u>
Bonsall	0	7	7
County Islands	1	1	2
Crest/Dehesa	0	4	4
Fallbrook	4	7	11
Jamul/Dulzura	0	1	1
Lakeside	6	9	15
Mountain Empire	0	2	2
North County Metro	8	15	23
Otay	10	1	11
Pala Pauma Valley	1	0	1
Rainbow	1	0	1
Ramona	3	4	7
San Dieguito	1	2	3
Spring Valley	0	2	2
Sweetwater	1	2	3
Valle de Oro	0	10	10
Valley Center	4	4	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<del>74</del> <u>75</u>	<del>119</del> <u>120</u>

Source: County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services, 2014.

## 2.8.2 Regulatory Framework

Chapter 2.9 of the General Plan Update PEIR, pages 2.9-22 through 2.9-27 describe the Regulatory Framework related to land use and is hereby incorporated by reference. Applicable State regulations discussed include: California Aeronautics Act; California Planning and Zoning Law; California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) General Plan Guidelines; Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO); Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) Act of 1991; and Senate Bill (SB) 375. Applicable Local regulations include: 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); Congestion Management Program (CMP); Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP); Community and Subregional Plans; Specific Plans; Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI); San Diego County Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP); County Trails

Program (CTP); County of San Diego Board of Supervisors Policies 1-63, 1-104, and J-33; Zoning Ordinance; San Diego County Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS); and the San Diego Basin Plan.

With the following exceptions, the regulatory framework discussion in the General Plan Update PEIR as pertains to land use has not changed since adoption of the General Plan in August 2011, applies equally to the Project areas addressed in this SEIR, and is therefore not repeated here.

### **2.8.2.1 State**

#### **California Office of Planning and Research General Plan Guidelines**

The General Plan Update PEIR states that the most recent version of the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) General Plan Guidelines was prepared in 2003. This remains a valid statement; however, it should be noted that the OPR is currently in the process of preparing its 2013 update of the General Plan Guidelines.

### **2.8.2.2 Local**

#### **County of San Diego Plans, Programs, Policies, and Regulations**

##### **San Diego County Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP)**

As updated in Section 2.4.2, Regulatory Framework, of this SEIR, the County is currently developing new MSCP Plans for the North County and East County areas. The Draft North County Plan is a stand-alone habitat conservation program for unincorporated lands under the County's jurisdiction in the northwestern part of the County, from the coast eastward to Ramona and the western flanks of Palomar Mountain. It is intended to create a 107,000-acre regional preserve system in northern San Diego County. Included are general measures for managing plant communities and specific habitats for over 60 species and recommendations for monitoring of plant communities and species. Public review of the Draft Plan and associated environmental analyses are scheduled for the fall of 2013. Development of the Draft East County Plan is currently on hold due to staffing and budget constraints. No projected schedule for the East County Plan is available at this time.

#### **Other Local Planning Regulations**

##### **San Diego County Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS)**

The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (APCD) recently updated the RAQS for 2009. The RAQS provides a program for attaining the standards for ozone and outlines the APCD's plans and control measures specifically designed to attain the California Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone. The RAQS, initially adopted in 1991, was updated in 1995, 1998, 2001, 2004, 2007, and 2009. Refer also to Section 2.3, Air Quality, of this SEIR for additional discussion.

## **San Diego Basin Plan**

The Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (Basin Plan) was most recently amended in 2011 and designates water quality objectives for constituents that could potentially cause an adverse effect or impact on the beneficial uses of water. The intent of the amended Basin Plan remains consistent with that described in Section 2.9.2.2, Local, of the General Plan Update PEIR.

## **2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)**

The General Plan Update PEIR includes the 2030 RTP; however, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) on October 28, 2011. This Plan supersedes the 2030 RTP. The Plan identifies projects to obligate projected revenues; allocating the largest proportion of the funds to transit projects, then the next largest portion for highway improvements, followed by local roads and streets.

Along with the 2050 RTP, the Board adopted the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The SCS details how the region will reduce greenhouse gas emissions to state-mandated levels over time. The inclusion of the SCS is required by Senate Bill 375, and the San Diego region is the first in California to produce a regional transportation plan with an SCS.

On November 28, 2011, a lawsuit was brought against the 2050 RTP PEIR claiming it did not adequately address reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. On December 3, 2012, the court found that the RTP EIR violated State law by failing to fully account for, and take steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The ruling requires SANDAG to conduct new environmental review for the 2050 RTP to ensure it adequately addresses the risk of climate change, which could result in revisions to the Plan.

### **2.8.3 Analysis of Proposed Project Effects and Cumulative Impacts**

The cumulative impact analysis study area for potential land use impacts in the General Plan Update PEIR was identified as the entire San Diego Region (Chapter 2.9). As the proposed Project is applying 2011 General Plan principles to assign land use designations for the FCI lands throughout the unincorporated area, the cumulative study area for potential land use impacts is the same as the General Plan Update PEIR and is hereby incorporated by reference. In addition, Section 1.9 of this SEIR (Cumulative Project Assessment Overview), provides an update of new projects since adoption of the 2011 General Plan that are considered in the cumulative analysis in order to make the analysis complete.

#### **2.8.3.1 Physical Division of an Established Community**

This section describes potential direct and cumulative impacts relative to physical division of an established community as it pertains to the Project areas addressed in this SEIR.

### Guidelines for the Determination of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project would have a potentially significant impact if it would physically divide an established community. For the purposes of this SEIR, established communities are defined as established town centers and communities described in Section 2.9.1.2, Community and Subregional Planning Areas (under Section 2.9.1, Existing Conditions), of the General Plan Update PEIR, and referenced above in Section 2.8.1.

### Analysis

The General Plan Update PEIR evaluated impacts from the adoption of the goals and policies of the 2011 General Plan countywide, including FCI lands. In addition, the General Plan Update PEIR evaluated buildout of the land use designations applied throughout the unincorporated area with the exception of former FCI lands. The General Plan Update PEIR determined that buildout under the 2011 General Plan would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts related to the physical division of an established community from the construction, expansion, or widening of a roadway. The discussion of impacts can be found in Chapter 2.9 Land Use of the General Plan Update PEIR and is hereby incorporated by reference. These impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance through the implementation of a combination of federal, State, and local regulations; existing County regulatory processes; the adopted 2011 General Plan goals and policies; and, specific mitigation measures/implementation programs identified in the General Plan Update PEIR.

As stated above, the General Plan Update PEIR determined that buildout under the 2011 General Plan would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts due to the physical division of an established community through placement of a road, railroad, airport, or large open space area. In particular, new roadways (e.g. multi-lane roads) and improvements to existing roadways (e.g. extension or widening) were identified in the Mobility Element of the 2011 General Plan. Such activities were found to have the potential to result in new roadways or improvements that would physically divide an established community, and therefore, impacts were determined to be potentially significant.

The proposed Project proposes a General Plan Amendment (GPA) to re-designate the former FCI lands to be consistent with the Guiding Principles and Policies of the adopted 2011 General Plan; changes in land use designations for approximately 400 acres of private lands adjacent to former FCI lands to ensure that the uses anticipated for these lands are consistent with the changes proposed; amendments to the Land Use Element to remove references to the FCI and to reflect changes in accordance with proposed land use map changes; amendments to the Alpine Community Plan and Central Mountain, Jamul/Dulzura and North Mountain Subregional Plans; minor changes to designations of several 2011 General Plan Mobility Element roadways; removal of the FCI Appendix from the 2011 General Plan; and, amendments to the County Zoning Ordinance, such that new zoning designations would be adopted to be consistent with the GPA. Implementation of the proposed Project would result in land use map changes that would

impact a number of roadway segments in the Alpine CPA. As discussed further in Section 2.13.3.1 of this SEIR, the roadway improvements recommended in the General Plan Update PEIR for the impacted deficient roadways in Alpine would mitigate most of the impacts associated with the proposed land use changes in the Project area; however, at buildout of the proposed Project a number of roadway segments would be maintained in their current classifications and operate at a deficient LOS. Regardless of deficient LOS on roadways within the Project area, the proposed Project includes the reclassification of only one road segment: Willows Road from Viejas Casino Road to the Interstate 8 westbound on-ramp from a two-lane to a four-lane road.

As described above, implementation of the proposed Project would result in the expansion through reclassification of one road segment in the Alpine CPA; but would not result in the planning for or construction of alternative transportation routes or associated large structures; or, establishment of any new large areas of open space that would have the potential to physically divide an established community. However, considering circulation impacts in the Alpine CPA as a result of the proposed Project would rely on roadway improvements and expansions outlined in the General Plan Update PEIR, the potentially significant impact determination identified in the General Plan Update PEIR related to dividing an established community would still apply to the proposed Project. The implementation of any federal, State, and local regulations; existing County regulatory processes; adopted 2011 General Plan goals and policies; and, specific mitigation measures/implementation programs identified in the General Plan Update PEIR would therefore be required to reduce potentially direct and cumulative significant proposed Project impacts.

The proposed Project would not result in impacts from the construction of alternative transportation routes or associated large structures (e.g. airports, railroad tracks) or from the designation of new areas of open space that would create a physical separation between established community areas and/or restrict access between such areas. Additionally, the proposed Project recommends the expansion of only one existing roadways beyond what is outlined in the General Plan Update PEIR. The General Plan Update PEIR determined that cumulative impacts as a result of several new roads and road extensions would have the potential to provide a cumulatively considerable significant impact.

### **2.8.3.2 Conflicts with Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations**

This section describes potential direct and cumulative impacts with regard to conflict with land use plans, policies, or regulations as pertains to the proposed Project areas addressed in this SEIR.

#### **Guidelines for the Determination of Significance**

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project would have a significant impact if it would conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency



with jurisdiction over the Project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact.

### Analysis

The General Plan Update PEIR evaluated impacts from the adoption of the goals and policies of the 2011 General Plan countywide, including FCI lands. In addition, the General Plan Update PEIR evaluated buildout of the land use designations applied throughout the unincorporated area with the exception of former FCI lands. The General Plan Update PEIR determined that buildout under the 2011 General Plan would not result in potentially significant direct or cumulative impacts resulting from conflict with land use plans, policies, or regulations. Therefore, impacts would remain below a level of significance, and the need for implementation of federal, State, and local regulations; existing County regulatory processes; adopted 2011 General Plan goals and policies; or, specific mitigation measures/implementation programs was not identified in the General Plan Update PEIR.

Similarly, no direct or cumulative impacts related to potential conflict with any applicable HCPs or NCCPs would occur with the proposed Project. The unincorporated County is addressed in the 2011 General Plan, as well as various regional planning documents such as the RCP, RTP, CMP, San Diego Basin Plan, County Trails Program, ALUCP, RAQS, community plans, and other plans identified and discussed in greater detail in Section 2.9, Land Use, of the General Plan Update PEIR.

As stated above, the proposed Project involves, among other actions, a GPA to re-designate the former FCI lands to be consistent with the adopted 2011 General Plan. The Project proposes changes in land use designations for certain private lands to ensure that the uses anticipated are consistent with the changes proposed; amendments to the Land Use Element, amendments to the Alpine Community Plan and the Central Mountain, Jamul/Dulzura and North Mountain Subregional Plans; and, amendments to the County Zoning Ordinance to ensure that new zoning designations would be adopted to be consistent with the GPA. The proposed Project is aimed at ensuring consistency with the 2011 General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and other relevant plans, as appropriate. Implementation of the proposed Project would allow for development of the former FCI lands in a manner that would be consistent with the intended future growth anticipated under the current 2011 General Plan for the affected communities within the unincorporated County.

Additionally, the proposed Project is not anticipated to contribute to cumulative impacts when considered with other cumulative projects with regard to conflict with land use plans, policies, or other applicable regulations. Discussion of conformance with relevant planning documents given in the General Plan Update PEIR remains relevant for the evaluation of potential impacts for the proposed Project. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the proposed Project would result in a potentially significant impact associated with the conflict with land use plans, policies, or regulations as pertains to the Project areas addressed in this SEIR. The implementation of any federal, State, and local regulations; existing County regulatory processes; adopted 2011 General

Plan goals and policies; or, specific mitigation measures/implementation programs identified in the General Plan Update PEIR would therefore not be required, nor would any additional measures not identified in the PEIR be required for the proposed Project. Proposed Project impacts with regard to conflict with land use plans, policies, or regulations would be below a level of significance.

### **2.8.3.3 *Conflicts with HCPs or NCCPs***

This section describes potential direct and cumulative impacts resulting from conflicts with HCPs or NCCPs as pertains to the Project areas addressed in this SEIR.

#### **Guidelines for the Determination of Significance**

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed General Plan Amendment would be considered to have a significant impact if it would conflict with any approved local, regional, or State-adopted HCP or NCCP.

#### **Analysis**

The General Plan Update PEIR evaluated impacts from the adoption of the goals and policies of the 2011 General Plan countywide, including FCI lands. In addition, the General Plan Update PEIR evaluated buildout of the land use designations applied throughout the unincorporated area with the exception of former FCI lands. The General Plan Update PEIR determined that buildout under the General Plan would not result in potentially significant direct or cumulative impacts resulting from conflict with an approved local, regional, or State-adopted HCP or NCCP. Therefore, impacts would remain below a level of significance, and the need for implementation of federal, State, and local regulations; existing County regulatory processes; 2011 General Plan goals and policies; or, specific mitigation measures/implementation programs was not identified in the General Plan Update PEIR.

Similarly, no direct or cumulative impacts related to potential conflict with any applicable HCPs or NCCPs would occur with the proposed Project. Project consistency with such plans is discussed in detail in Section 2.4.3.6, Habitat Conservation Plans and NCCPs. All future development on lands affected by the proposed Project would be required to comply with applicable HCPs and NCCPs. Existing regulatory processes to ensure the development is in conformance with such plans, as applicable, would not be removed or otherwise affected by the proposed Project. Therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable HCP or NCCP, and impacts would be below a level of significance. The implementation of any federal, State, and local regulations; existing County regulatory processes; 2011 General Plan goals and policies; or, specific mitigation measures/implementation programs identified in the General Plan Update PEIR would therefore not be required, nor would any additional measures not identified in the PEIR be required for the proposed Project.

## 2.8.4 Mitigation

### 2.8.4.1 *Physical Division of an Established Community*

Impacts regarding the physical division of an established community associated with the proposed Project would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of the same applicable 2011 General Plan policies and mitigation measures as those identified in the General Plan Update PEIR, and repeated below.

#### Adopted 2011 General Plan Policies

**Policy LU-1.4: Village Expansion.** Permit new Village Regional Category designated land uses only where contiguous with an existing or planned Village and where all of the following criteria are met:

- Potential Village development would be compatible with environmental conditions and constraints, such as topography and flooding;
- Potential Village development would be accommodated by the 2011 General Plan road network;
- Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents; and
- The expansion is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area

**Policy LU-2.1: Community Plans.** Maintain updated Community Plans, as part of the General Plan, to guide development to reflect the character and vision for each individual unincorporated community, consistent with the General Plan.

**Policy LU-2.3: Development Densities and Lot Sizes.** Assign densities and minimum lot sizes in a manner that is compatible with the character of each unincorporated community.

**Policy LU-2.5: Greenbelts to Define Communities.** Identify and maintain greenbelts between communities to reinforce the identity of individual communities.

**Policy LU-4.1: Regional Planning.** Participate in regional planning to ensure that the unique communities, assets, and challenges of the unincorporated lands are appropriately addressed with the implementation of the planning principles and land use requirements of SB 375.

**Policy LU-4.2: Review of Impacts of Projects in Adjoining Jurisdictions.** Review, comment, and coordinate when appropriate on plans, projects, and proposals of overlapping or neighboring agencies to ensure compatibility with the County's General Plan, and that adjacent communities are not adversely impacted.

**Policy LU-4.3: Relationship of Plans in Adjoining Jurisdictions.** Consider the plans and projects of overlapping or neighboring agencies in the planning of unincorporated lands, and invite comments and coordination when appropriate.

**Policy LU-4.4: Development Compatibility with Military Facilities.** Ensure compatibility of new development with the current and planned mission and operations of U.S. government military installations.

**Policy LU-11.2: Compatibility with Community Character.** Require that commercial, office, and industrial development be located, scaled, and designed to be compatible with the unique character of the community.

**Policy LU-12.4: Planning for Compatibility.** Plan and site infrastructure for public utilities and public facilities in a manner compatible with community character, minimize visual and environmental impacts, and whenever feasible, locate any facilities and supporting infrastructure outside preserve areas. Require context sensitive Mobility Element road design that is compatible with community character and minimizes visual and environmental impacts.

**Policy M-10.6: On-Street Parking.** Minimize on-street vehicular parking outside villages and Rural Villages where on-street parking is not needed, to reduce the width of paved shoulders and provide an opportunity for bicycle lanes to retain rural character in low-intensity areas. Where on-street parking occurs outside Villages and Rural Villages, require the design to be consistent with the rural character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

**Policy H-2.1: Development That Respects Community Character.** Require that development in existing residential neighborhoods be well designed so as not to degrade or detract from the character of surrounding development consistent with the Land Use Element. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

**Policy M-1.3: Treatment of High-Volume Roadways.** To avoid bisecting communities or town centers, consider narrower rights-of-way, flexibility in design standards, and lower design speeds in areas planned for substantial development. Reduce noise, air, and visual impacts of new freeways, regional arterials, and Mobility Element roads, through landscaping, design, and/or careful location of facilities.

These policies require future circulation improvements and developments to be consistent with the character of an established community, require road design considerations that avoid bisecting communities or town centers, support conservation-oriented project design when consistent the applicable community plan, require certain residential subdivisions to conserve open space and natural resources, require incorporation of natural features into proposed development, require contiguous open space areas, require new development to conform to the natural topography, require new residential development to be integrated with existing neighborhoods, and require the location and development of private roads to minimize visual

impacts. Adherence to these policies will reduce potential impacts associated with physical division of established communities from future development and infrastructure.

### **Mitigation Measures**

The following mitigation measures would mitigate direct and cumulative impacts associated with the physical division of an established community to below a level of significance.

- Lan-1.1** Coordinate with adjacent cities and other agencies regarding planning efforts and resource protection. This includes working with SANDAG during updates to the RTP to ensure that regional roads are properly planned, sited, and designed. Additional on-going consultations include coordination with state, federal, and local agencies regarding the high speed rail, the Sunrise Powerlink, and tribal casinos.
- Lan-1.2** Coordinate with land owners, other departments, and community groups to ensure that both public and private development projects and associated infrastructure minimize impacts to established communities. This involves community input and General Plan conformance reviews on County road projects to insure that County road planning and development is consistent with the General Plan. This also includes analysis of potential environmental impacts for public and private road projects and application of mitigation measures pursuant to CEQA. DPW policies and procedures shall be evaluated to ensure that such reviews are conducted and that issues regarding potential division of communities are identified and addressed. General Plan Amendments that propose changes to the circulation network shall be kept consistent with the General Plan Goals and Policies, and such proposals will also be reviewed by the communities. In addition, Board Policy I-63 and/or department procedures will be updated to meet this standard.
- Lan-1.3** Maintain plans and standards for infrastructure and roads so that divisions of communities do not occur. This will include: 1) updates to County Road Standards to ensure that roads are designed and built in a safe manner consistent with the General Plan and community context; 2) adherence to Community Plans to guide infrastructure planning in the individual and unique communities of the County; 3) evaluation and, if necessary, revisions to the subdivision ordinance to ensure future project designs, and corresponding infrastructure designs, are consistent with the General Plan and with established community character; 4) preparation of local public road network plans to improve mobility, connectivity, and safety; and 5) preparation of community road standards that supplement the County road standards in order to recognize the unique constraints and character of different communities.

Lan-1.1 specifically requires coordination to ensure that regional roads are properly planned, sited, and designed. Consultation and coordination will allow better planning of infrastructure

and prevent significant impacts to communities from incompatible facilities. Lan-1.2 involves community input and 2011 General Plan conformance reviews on County road projects to ensure that County road planning and development is consistent with the 2011 General Plan. This also includes analysis of potential impacts for public and private road projects and application of mitigation measures pursuant to CEQA. In addition, Board Policy I-63, which contains provisions for General Plan Amendments, and/or department procedures will be updated to meet this standard. Lan-1.3 will ensure that: 1) that roads are designed and built in a safe manner consistent with the 2011 General Plan and community context; 2) roads are designed and built in adherence to Community Plans to guide infrastructure planning 3) revisions to the subdivision ordinance to ensure future project designs, and corresponding infrastructure designs, are consistent with the 2011 General Plan and with established community character; 4) local public road network plans to improve mobility, connectivity, and safety are prepared; and 5) community road standards that supplement the County road standards are prepared and recognize the uniqueness of different communities. These efforts will minimize the potential impacts of future infrastructure on established communities.

#### ***2.8.4.2 Conflict with Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations***

Impacts associated with conflicts with applicable land use plan, policies, or regulations would be below a level of significance. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

#### ***2.8.4.3 Conflicts with HCPs or NCCPs***

Impacts associated with conflicts with adopted HCPs and NCCPs would be below a level of significance. Therefore, no mitigation is required.